



REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE (RFA) FORM INTAKE INTERVIEW LOG

<u>Date:</u> 2/9/18	<u>Interviewer:</u> Lafayette Baker	RFA #18 – 10
<u>Name of Person(s) Requesting Assistance:</u> [REDACTED]		
<u>Contact Numbers (telephone, e-mail, etc.):</u> [REDACTED]		
<u>Status of Person(s) Interviewed (title, position, student status, etc.):</u> Staff member		
<u>Requested Assistance Pertaining To (name, position, policy, project, etc.):</u> [REDACTED]		

To the best of your knowledge, please fill out the following:

Interviewee Status: Male ☐ Female ☒ Administrator ☐ Faculty ☐ Staff ☐ Student ☐
 Concern Regarding: Male ☐ Female ☐ Administrator ☐ Faculty ☐ Staff ☒ Student ☐

Category: (Please check at least one)

- | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Age | <input type="checkbox"/> Color | <input type="checkbox"/> Creed | <input type="checkbox"/> Disability | <input type="checkbox"/> Veteran Status |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Marital Status | <input type="checkbox"/> National Origin | <input type="checkbox"/> Race | <input type="checkbox"/> Religion | <input type="checkbox"/> Retaliation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> XX Sex/Gender | <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual Harassment | <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual Orientation | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment | <input type="checkbox"/> Genetic Information |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gender Identity or Expression | | | | |

Time Line		
Date	Item	Comments
2/9/18	[REDACTED] called the EO Office	[REDACTED] told LB that she would like to speak with someone regarding an EO issue
2/9/18	LB met with [REDACTED]	LB explains the EO Office Resolution processes, "Protocol," including differences between the informal resolution process and filing a formal discrimination complaint. LB also discusses the EO Office's limits on confidentiality (including the Public Records Act) and the prohibition against retaliation, as well as resources and reporting options. [REDACTED] indicated she did not want to file a formal complaint and that she wanted an informal resolution. [REDACTED] explained that she works in [REDACTED] as the [REDACTED]. During a meeting on 2/7/18 while screening

		<p>current [REDACTED] who want to return next year, one of the [REDACTED] said one of the current [REDACTED] is quirky, dresses a certain way, and the [REDACTED] is a sexual assault survivor.</p> <p>[REDACTED] asked [REDACTED] if the [REDACTED] was public about the fact that she is a sexual assault survivor. [REDACTED] said she taught the [REDACTED] class, and that the [REDACTED] wrote in one of her papers that she was a sexual assault survivor. Another [REDACTED], said he did not know what that had to do with what was going on there.</p> <p>After the meeting, [REDACTED] supervisor [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] "I notice the visceral reaction you had to that, and I want you to know that I followed up with [REDACTED] and I let her know that was inappropriate."</p> <p>[REDACTED] said she is concerned because [REDACTED] should not have made the comment during the hiring situation. [REDACTED] believes that it did not feel appropriate for that level of personal information to be shared. Plus, a survivor's status should not be shared with people who could be her supervisor, and have power over her.</p> <p>[REDACTED] was concerned regarding the number of people in the room, [REDACTED], all the [REDACTED]s except for one, and [REDACTED] said no one said anything except after the comment was made except [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].</p>
2/9/18	LB called [REDACTED]	LB asked [REDACTED] what is her preferred outcome regarding this situation. [REDACTED] explained that she does not think it is acceptable that someone in their third year as an [REDACTED] does not know better. She wants there to be some type of training regarding working with survivors and dealing with private information.
2/16/18	[REDACTED] called LB	[REDACTED] checked on the status of her concern
2/16/18	LB called [REDACTED]	LB told [REDACTED] that he talked to SGS regarding her concern, and LB and SGS will talk to [REDACTED]. After SGS and LB talks to [REDACTED], they will follow-up with [REDACTED] regarding their next steps.
2/22/18	LB and SGS met with [REDACTED]	LB and SGS discussed the fact that [REDACTED] came in regarding the comment [REDACTED] made, and she was very upset about the situation. [REDACTED] explained the context regarding [REDACTED] comment, and indicated that [REDACTED] was possibly trying to advocate for the [REDACTED] and show that she is resilient. However, he acknowledged that the comment was

		inappropriate. [REDACTED] said he or [REDACTED] would follow up with [REDACTED] regarding the comment.
2/22/18	[REDACTED] emailed LB	[REDACTED] confirmed that [REDACTED] was followed-up with.
3/2/18	LB called [REDACTED]	LB confirmed a 3/6 3pm follow-up meeting with [REDACTED].
3/5/18	LB met with [REDACTED]	<p>LB explained to [REDACTED] that he and SGS had a very good meeting with [REDACTED] regarding her concern. [REDACTED] confirmed that [REDACTED] was counseled with about this situation, and he discussed this situation with [REDACTED], the Associate Director. They plan to implement some changes to avoid occurrences like this in the future.</p> <p>[REDACTED] explained that she thinks it will be unfortunate if the whole process changes, but she is glad that [REDACTED] was talked to. She hopes there is some type of trauma informed training for how to work with survivors. She indicated that she is comfortable where this is currently.</p>